



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,121	07/12/2005	Richard Petrus Kleihorst	NL 030005	8392
24737 7590 05/04/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER HAILEMARIAM, EMMANUEL	
			ART UNIT 2609	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/542,121

Applicant(s)

KLEIHORST ET AL.

Examiner

Emmanuel Hailemariam

Art Unit

2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/19/05 07/12/05.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because it does not show “ **adjacent viewing zone partly overlap.... “as in claim10**. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either

“Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase “Not Applicable” should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING (S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A

“Sequence Listing” is required on paper if the application discloses a

nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "the device has means for visually identification of the viewing zone "claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1- 7,9 ,10 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (6424323) in view of Motosyuku et al (5602566).

AS to claim 1, Bell discloses handheld device (fig.1 (10)) with a display screen (fig.1 (12), and means for displaying a document on the screen (fig.1 (8)), characterized in that the device comprises a splitting screen (fig.1 (8)) in front of the display screen (fig.1 (8)) for splitting the image in a number of sub-images in a number of viewing

zones (fig.4, 5(8) (12), and in operation for each or for a number of viewing zones (fig.4, 5(8) a different part of a document is visible in a manner such that when tilting the device the parts of the document are visible in a sequential manner (col.1 lines 37-43) (Col.3 lines 24-30 see fig.2), (col.2 lines 1-5). But Bell does not expressly disclose means for scrolling through the document by tilting the device.

Motosyuku) however, discloses a means for scrolling through the document by tilting the device (Fig. 1 (102), fig.3, fig.6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Motosyuku's scrolling method in to Bells' display system, because, this will provide the user an easy way of scrolling of a document without requiring any operation by the other hand.

AS to claim 2, combined references of Bell and Motosyuku disclose a handheld device as claimed in claim 1. In addition, Bell discloses that the device has a display screen with a horizontal (x) (see. fig.1 (24) col.2 lines 1-4) and a vertical (y) (see fig.3 (22) direction, and the splitting screen is horizontally oriented (see fig.1 (24), col.2 lines 62 col. 3, lines 2).

AS to claim 3, combined references of Bell and Motosyuku disclose a handheld device as claimed in claim 1. Bell also discloses that that the device has a display screen with a horizontal (x) (see fig.1 (24)) and a vertical (y) (see fig.3 (22) direction, and the splitting screen is vertically oriented (col.3 lines 56-66 fig.3 (22) (fig.4).

AS to claims 4 and 5, combined references of Bell and Motosyuku disclose a handheld device. Besides, bell discloses that, characterized in that the number of sub-images in at least 4/10 (see fig.3 (22)).

AS to claim 6, combined references of Bell and Motosyuku disclose a handheld device as claimed in claim 1. In addition, Bell discloses that the device has a selector for selecting the orientation of the image displayed on the screen (see. Abstract, col.1 lines 39-43); however, Bell does not teach, a selector for selecting at the orientation of the image display at least comprising two substantially orthogonal orientations.

However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to have recognized that hand held device of Bell has to have a selector in order to select the orientation on the display to have a horizontal or vertical orientation (see, Abstract, col2, lines 1-5, col.3 lines 1-2, 56-59).

AS to claim 7, Bell discloses splitting screen is a lenticular screen (see. Abstract fig.3 (24) col.1 lines 53-55).

AS to claim 9, Bell discloses that the device has a means for selecting the number of adjacent viewing zones in which the same part of the document is displayed for displaying the same sub-images (fig.4, 5 (8,12) in a number of adjacent viewing zones (col.3 lines 53-67).

AS to claim 10, Bell discloses that in operation parts of the documents displayed in adjacent viewing zones partly overlap (figs.4,5 (8,12) . (At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to recognize that

since the two viewing zones are separate at the boundary where the two zones meets, at least there exists a certain level of overlap).

AS to claim 12, Bell discloses a means for enabling the user to report to the device the viewing zone the viewer is viewing (col.3 lines 3-30).

6. Claim 8 and 11, are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (6,424,323) in view of Iwata et al. (5,982,343).

As to claim 8, Bell teaches a splitting screen (figs.1, 2 (8)), but failed to teach the screen being a parallax barrier screen. Iwata et al. is cited to teach that it is well known to have a parallax barrier screen (figs. 3 and 4 (12)).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Iwata's parallax screen in to Bell's display system, because this will enable the observer to observe 3-D image by projecting parallax images to both eyes of the observer.

AS to claim 11, Iwata also discloses that the device has means for visual identification of the viewing zone (see.fig.36 (50-n), col.938-40).

Claim 13, are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. (6424323) in view of Motosyuku (5602566) further in view of Eichenlaub (5,500,765).

As to claim 13, Bell as modified by Motosyuku, teach a lenticular display device, but failed to teach to switching 2D to 3-D display mode. However, Eichenlabu teach alenticular display, switching to 3-D display mode (see Abstract), col.4 44-47 fig.4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use (Eichenlaub) 3-D display system in to Bell's device ,since this will allow to have a very cost effective 3-D auto stereoscopic image.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Woodgate (US7058252) disclose a optical switching apparatus.

Correspondence

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Hailemariam whose telephone number is 571-270-1545. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


AMARE MENGISTU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER